

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/851,614	05/08/2001	Yashwant M. Deo	MXI-166	4957	
959 LAHIVE & CO	7590 05/17/2007 OCKFIELD, LLP		EXAM	EXAMINER	
ONE POST OFFICE SQUARE			EWOLDT,	EWOLDT, GERALD R	
BOSTON, MA	02109-2127		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1644		
			•		
•			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			05/17/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/851,614	DEO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
i	G. R. Ewoldt, Ph.D.	1644	

			I
	G. R. Ewoldt, Ph.D.	1644	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>28 March 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Nota Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, affortice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in one with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire!	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejecti	on.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) a
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compfiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief.	will not be entered b	ecause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co	nsideration and/or search (see NO		
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below			
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be	tter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying	the issues for
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rei	ected claims	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)			(1 TOE 02+).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the
7. Solution For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		II be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>94 and 99-107</u> .		•	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	d sufficient reasons why the affidav	it or other evidence is	necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fai	ls to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	it does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowar	nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).	4	\sim
13. Other:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	100	wald.
		5/10/0	7
			OLDT, PH.D. EXAMINER

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): rejections over the recitation of "conservative sequence modifications" and the rejection of Claims 94, 99, 105 and 107 for lack of enablement.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: As set forth above, the rejections over the recitation of "conservative sequence modifications" have been withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for inadequate written description (including the introduction of new matter into the claims) and lack of enablement are maintained for the reasons of record.

Applicant argues that the CDRs of the antibody of Claim 94 are found in the antibody of SEQ ID NOS: 2 and 4. Applicant describes how the antibody of the claims could be made.

Applicant is advised that the rejections of Sections 4 and 5 of the Final Office action of 1/03/07 are for inadequate written description, not for lack of enablement. That it might be possible to produce the antibodies is irrelevant - Applicant has not shown possession of said antibodies. Further, no antibodies comprising the properties of Claims 100-107 are described at all.

Applicant argues that inherent properties need not be described.

It is unclear that any antibodies with the properties of the claims exist; certainly none are adequately described. There is no evidence that any antibody simply comprising the CDRs of SEQ ID NOS; 2 and 4 would comprise any particular structural or functional properties.

Applicant argues that the antibodies of the claims are contemplated by the present specification.

The claimed antibodies are not described by the instant specification.

Applicant describes the manipulation of CDRs to produce various antibodies.

Applicant's discussion of antibody manipulation does not comprise an adequate written description of the claimed antibodies.

Regarding the enablement rejection of Section 6, as set forth previously, no antibodies comprising just the CDRs of SEQ ID NOS: 2 and 4, further comprising the limitations of Claims 100-104 and 106 are disclosed. Further, absent a trial and error approach (which is not enabled) it is unclear how the claimed antibodies could be made.